

The Honorable Benjamin Settle

Joseph Schodowski, WSBA #42910  
Ryan D. Dreveskracht, WSBA #42593  
Galanda Broadman, PLLC  
8606 35th Avenue NE, Suite L1  
P.O. Box 15146  
Seattle, WA 98115  
Phone: (206) 557-7509  
Fax: (206) 299-7690  
Attorneys for Plaintiff

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

SARAH BONES, in her Personal Capacity,  
and as Personal Representative of the Estate  
of JOSHUA BONES, deceased; C.G., a  
minor, by and through his Guardian,  
SARAH BONES; and T.G., a minor, by  
and through his Guardian, SARAH  
BONES,

Plaintiffs,

v.

WELLPATH; COUNTY OF CLALLAM,  
WASHINGTON, a Political Subdivision of  
the State of Washington; BILL  
BENEDICT; DON WENTZEL; TYLER  
CORTANI; LETICIA RUBALCAVA;  
KRISTIN MICHELLE PUHL; ALICIA C.  
LONG; EDWARD S. BERETTA; LINSEY  
JANE MONAGHAN; TAMARA  
VANOVER; KATHERINE E. JONES; and  
JOHN DOES 1-10,

Defendants.

NO. 2:24-CV-00110

COMBINED JOINT STATUS  
REPORT AND DISCOVERY  
PLAN

Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 16, 26(f), Plaintiffs Sarah Bones, C.G., and T.G., by and through  
their guardian, Sarah Bones; Sarah Bones as Personal Representative of the Estate of Joshua Bones  
("Plaintiffs"), together with Defendants Clallam County, Bill Benedict, Don Wenzl, Tyler Cortani,  
Kristin Michelle Puhl, Edward S. Beretta, Linsay Jane Monaghan, and Tamara Vanover, ("County

Defendants), as well as Wellpath, LLC and Alicia C. Long (“Wellpath Defendants”), through counsel, (collectively the “Parties”) submit the following Joint Status Report and Discovery Plan.

**1. A statement of the nature and complexity of the case.**

This case involves state law negligence and federal Civil Rights claims under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 arising from the suicide of Joshua Bones at the Clallam County Corrections Facility in December of 2022. The case’s complexity is typical of such an action.

**2. Whether the parties consent to assignment of this case to a full time United States Magistrate Judge, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §636(c) and Local Rule MJR 13 to conduct all proceedings.**

No.

**3. A proposed deadline for the joining of additional parties.**

The deadline for joining additional Parties should be 90 days following the filing of this Joint Status Report.

**4. A proposed deadline for the filing of the Motion for Class Certification.**

This provision is not applicable, as this is not a class action.

**5. A discovery plan that states, by corresponding paragraph letters, the parties' views and proposals on all items in Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(f)(3), which includes the following topics:**

**(A) Initial disclosures.**

The Parties have agreed to waive initial disclosures.

**(B) Subjects, timing, and potential phasing of discovery.**

Plaintiffs anticipate discovery on all aspects of the allegations in their Complaint. Defendants anticipate discovery on Plaintiffs’ claims and potential defenses thereto.

The Parties do not believe that discovery need be conducted in phases, except that expert discovery will necessarily take place after the expert disclosure deadlines established by the Court in the case schedule. *See also* Sections 6(d) (“Discovery Management”) and 6(e) (“Anticipated

discovery sought”) below. Relatedly, the Parties also disagree as to whether expert witness disclosures should be simultaneous or staggered. *See* Section 21, below.

**(C) Issues with discovery or electronically stored information.**

Certain discovery has already been exchanged which may expedite the discovery going forward in this case. The Parties are not aware of any other unusual discovery issues at this time. The Parties intend to use the Model Protocol for Discovery of Electronically Stored Information in Civil Litigation.

**(D) Privilege issues.**

The Parties are not aware of any unusual privilege issues at this time. If issues concerning privileged information arise in the future, the Parties will discuss and attempt to resolve those issues between the Parties before seeking court intervention.

**(E) Proposed limitations on discovery.**

The Parties currently believe that the limitations on discovery imposed by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the Local Rules are appropriate. If any additional discovery is needed (beyond those limitations), counsel will attempt to stipulate to that additional discovery before seeking court approval.

**(F) The need for any discovery related orders.**

The Parties anticipate that the exchange of confidential, proprietary, or private information will require the issuance of a protective order based on the Court’s Model Stipulated Protective Order. The relevance of Plaintiff’s medical records may also require the Parties to move to seal those records if they need to be filed with the Court. The Parties do not anticipate the need for an additional protective order or discovery related orders at this time, but may seek an order should the need arise.

**6. The Parties’ views, proposals, and agreements, by corresponding paragraph letters, on all items set forth in Local Civil Rule 26(f)(1), which includes the following topics:**

**(A) Prompt case resolution.**

1 The Parties currently have no specific suggestions for promptly settling or otherwise  
2 resolving the case.

3 **(B) Alternative dispute resolution.**

4 The Parties are open to mediating this dispute at the appropriate time. Generally, the  
5 Parties prefer mediation at or near the close of discovery, and after resolution of potentially  
6 dispositive motions.

7 **(C) Related cases.**

8 The Parties are unaware of any related cases.

9 **(D) Discovery management.**

10 The Parties believe that discovery should be managed as provided for in the Federal Rules  
11 of Civil Procedure and Local Rules. The parties have agreed to email or other electronic service  
12 of discovery materials where possible. The Parties do not currently seek additional management  
13 on discovery issues at this time, but may seek an order or other guidance from the Court should  
14 the need arise.

15 **(E) Anticipated discovery sought.**

16 The Parties anticipate discovery depositions of the parties and non-party witnesses, and  
17 discovery pursuant to Rules of Civil Procedure 33, 34, and 36, and agree to utilize stipulations and  
18 authorizations to obtain relevant records from non-parties as much as possible.

19 Plaintiff currently intends to conduct discovery on the following topics:

- 20 1. Any familiarity with Plaintiff and his health history that Defendants and their  
21 employees, agents, ostensible agents, and contractors may have been aware of.
- 22 2. The practices and procedures employed by Defendants regarding standards of  
23 health treatment.
- 24 3. Medical and correctional staffing levels at the Clallam County Jail.
- 25 4. Clallam County Policies and procedures.
5. Healthcare policies and procedures.
6. Training, policies, and procedures employed at the Clallam County Jail.

1 7. Training, policies, and procedures employed by Clallam County Jail  
2 subcontractors.

3 8. Record keeping of all Defendants.

4 9. Other incidents, lawsuits, claims, reports, and grievances alleging inadequate or  
5 inappropriate medical or psychiatric care and/or treatment from Defendants.

6 10. The response, if any, by Defendants' officials to other such incidents.

7 11. The identities and roles of all employees, agents, ostensible agents, and contractors  
8 were involved with or responsible for providing care to Plaintiff.

9 12. The identities of all persons who may have knowledge of Plaintiff's condition,  
10 and/or Defendants' response.

11 13. Electronic documents and metadata referring or related to Plaintiff.

12 14. Correspondence, memoranda, e-mails, and other documents pertaining to the  
13 foregoing topics.

14 Defendants currently intend to conduct discovery on all aspects of the liability claims  
15 asserted and the damages alleged.

16 **(F) Phasing of motions.**

17 The Parties do not believe that phasing of motions is desirable.

18 **(G) Preservation of discoverable information.**

19 The Parties do not foresee issues with the preservation of or production of electronically  
20 stored information.

21 **(H) Privilege issues.**

22 The Parties are not aware of any unusual privilege issues at this time. If issues concerning  
23 privileged information arise in the future, the parties will discuss and attempt to resolve those  
24 issues between the parties before seeking court intervention.

25 **(I) Model Protocol for Discovery of ESI.**

1 The Parties expect that the case will involve the preservation and production of  
2 Electronically Stored Information and wish to use the Model Protocol for Discovery of  
3 Electronically Stored Information in Civil Litigation.

4 **(J) Alternatives to the Model Protocol.**

5 The Parties do not wish to use any alternatives to the Model Protocol.

6 **7. The date by which discovery can be completed.**

7 The Parties believe that discovery can be completed by 120 days prior to trial.

8 **8. Whether the case should be bifurcated by trying the liability issues before the  
9 damages issues, or bifurcated in any other way.**

10 At this time the parties do not anticipate the need for bifurcation. This issue will be  
11 reassessed during discovery.

12 **9. Whether the pretrial statements and pretrial order called for by Local Civil  
13 Rules 16(e), (h), (i), and (k), and 16.1 should be dispensed with in whole or in part for  
14 the sake of economy.**

15 The Parties agree that they will comply with, and not dispense with, pretrial statements and  
16 the pretrial order, but the Parties wish to reserve the right to seek leave to dispense with such  
17 statements if it becomes apparent that they are not necessary.

18 **10. Whether the parties intend to utilize the Individualized Trial Program set  
19 forth in Local Civil Rule 39.2.**

20 The Parties do not wish to utilize the Individualized Trial Program set forth in Local Civil  
21 Rule 39.2.

22 **11. Whether the parties intend to utilize any Alternative Dispute Resolution  
23 (“ADR”) options set forth in Local Civil Rule 39.1.**

24 The Parties do not wish to utilize the Alternative Dispute Resolution (“ADR”) options set  
25 forth in Local Civil Rule 39.1.

**12. Any other suggestions for shortening or simplifying the case.**

The Parties currently have no specific suggestions for shortening or simplifying the case.

**13. The date the case will be ready for trial. The Court expects that most civil  
cases will be ready for trial within a year after filing the Joint Status Report and  
Discovery Plan. If the parties will be proposing a trial date more than fourteen months**

1 from the date of the filing of the Joint Status Report, the parties shall include in this  
2 section of the report an explanation as to why the additional time is required.

3 At the present time, plaintiffs' counsel does not have any conflicts if a January 2026 trial  
4 date is assigned.

5 At this time, defense counsel does not have any conflicts if a January 2026 trial date is  
6 assigned.

7 **14. Whether the trial will be jury or non-jury.**

8 Plaintiff has demanded a jury. The Defendants likewise demand trial by jury.

9 **15. The number of trial days required.**

10 The Parties believe that 10 trial days of 8 hours will be required.

11 **16. The names, addresses, and telephone numbers of all trial counsel.**

12 Attorneys for Plaintiffs

13 GALANDA BROADMAN, PLLC  
14 Ryan D. Dreveskracht, WSBA # 42593  
15 P. O. Box 15146, Seattle, WA 98115  
(206) 909-3842  
ryan@galandabroadman.com  
joe@galandabroadman.com

16 SCHODOWSKI LAW, INC. PS  
17 Joseph Schodowski, WSBA # 42910  
18 210 Polk Street, Suite 8,  
19 Port Townsend, WA 98368  
(360) 821-8873  
joe@schodowskilaw.com

20 Attorney for County Defendants

21 LAW LYMAN DANIEL KAMERRER & BOGDANOVICH PS  
22 John Edward Justice, WSBA No. 23042  
23 2674 RW Johnson Blvd SW  
24 Tumwater, WA 98512  
(360) 754-3480  
jjjustice@lldkb.com

25 Attorneys for Wellpath Defendants

FOX BALLARD  
Jonathan D. Ballard, WSBA No. 48870  
Ross C. Taylor, WSBA No. 48111  
1325 Fourth Avenue, Suite 1500, Seattle WA 98101  
(206) 800-2727  
jonathan@foxballard.com  
ross@foxballard.com

**17. The dates on which the trial counsel may have complications to be considered in setting a trial date.**

The Wellpath Defendants' Counsel have the following conflicts at present:

<b>Dates Unavailable</b>	<b>Reasons Unavailable</b>	<b>Conflict Trial: Court Name &amp; Cause Number</b>
January 27, 2025 – February 12, 2025	Trial	USDC W. WA 3:21-cv-05761-TL
April 8, 2025 – May 16, 2025	Trial	USDC E. WA 2:22-cv-00256-TOR
May 1, 2025 – May 12, 2025	Out of country	
July 15, 2025 – August 20, 2025	Trial	
September 9, 2025 – September 30, 2025	Trial	USDC W. WA 3:24-cv-05185-TMC
October 20, 2025 – November 5, 2025	Trial	USDC W. WA 3:24-CV-05202




Counsel for Clallam County's Trial Conflicts:

1. Horwitz v. UW, King Co. Sup. Ct. 1/20/25 (two weeks)
2. A.D. v. State, King County Superior Court, 2/3/25 (two weeks)
3. Choi v. Lakewood, Pierce County 2/11/2025 (two weeks)
4. Matt Murphy v. Clallam County, Kitsap County Superior Ct. – 2/25/25 (two weeks)
5. Wright v. State, USDC 3/17/2025 (two weeks)
6. Cole v. Longview, USDC 3/31/25 (10 days)
7. Van Loo (Estate of Reinoehl) v. Lakewood, et al., USDC - 4/28/25 (3 weeks)
8. Estate of Keller v. Skamania County, Clark County Superior Court - 5/5/2025 (two weeks)
9. Jamika Scott v. Tacoma, USDC – 6/2/25 (3 weeks)
10. Estate of Anderson v. Mason County, Thurston County Superior Court – 6/9/2025 (five days)
11. Williamson v. Lakewood, US District Court – 6/16/2025 (10 days)
12. Maryelena Clark v. State of WA, Thurston Co. – 7/7/2025 (8 days)
13. Jennings, Jr. v. PNWMX and Grays Harbor County – 7/28/25 at 9 a.m.
14. Perillo v. Island County – Snohomish County Superior Court - 8/25/25 to 9/5/25

Counsel for the Plaintiff's Trial Counsel

1. Fair v. King County et al. | W.D. Wash USDC Case No. 2:21-cv-01706-JHC February 18, 2025 trial

2. Cole et al v. City of Longview, et al | WAWD USDC Case No. 3:24-cv-05023 March 31, 2025 trial

**18. If, on the due date of the Report, all Defendant(s) or respondent(s) have not been served, counsel for Plaintiff(s) shall advise the Court when service will be effected, why it was not made earlier, and shall provide a proposed schedule for the required FRCP 26(f) conference and FRCP 26(a) initial disclosures.**

All named defendants have either been served or have waived service.

**19. Whether any party wishes to have a scheduling conference before the Court enters a scheduling order in the case.**

Yes. The Parties request a scheduling conference to address the disagreement regarding staggered witness disclosures, as discussed in Section 21, below.

**20. List the date(s) that each and every nongovernmental corporate party filed its disclosure statement pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 7.1 and Local Rule 7.1.**

N/A

**21. Disagreement on Staggering Expert Disclosures.**

The Parties disagree on the issue of staggering expert disclosures. The Parties agree the Court has discretion to order either simultaneous or staggered expert disclosures. Plaintiffs and Defendants provide their respective positions, as follows:

**A. Plaintiff's Position on Staggered Disclosures.**

Plaintiff's position is that expert disclosures should be made simultaneously by both parties to ensure fairness and avoid any strategic advantages. Staggering expert disclosures would give the Defendants two bites at the apple in that, after reading Plaintiff's initial expert reports, Defendants would be able to respond to those reports in both their initial reports and rebuttal reports. This creates an unfair strategic advantage, allowing the defense to tailor their expert opinions based on the Plaintiff's disclosed theories and evidence, which undermines the principle of an even playing field in litigation.

**B. Defendants Position.**

The Defendants propose the case schedule provide staggered disclosure of Plaintiff and Defense expert witnesses. Courts in this District have recognized a benefit to staggering expert witness disclosures. *See, e.g. U.S. Bank, N.A. v. Glogowski Law Firm, PLLC*, 339 F.R.D. 579, 581-582 (sequencing expert disclosures to require the party with the burden of proof to disclose

1 first can benefit case efficiency). Other District Courts have recognized that in particular for  
2 cases involving standard of care violations, “defendant's experts would need to know in advance  
3 what theories were being advanced by plaintiffs through their experts to which defendant's  
4 experts would need to respond.” *Mabrey v. United States*, 2006 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 49039, \*8,  
5 citing *Plumbers & Pipefitters Local 572 Pension Fund v. Cisco Sys.*, 411 F. Supp. 2d 1172, 2005  
6 WL 1459572 (N.D. Cal. 2005). It has thus been reasoned that “requiring plaintiffs to make their  
7 Rule 26(a)(2) disclosures in advance of defendants [is] more consistent with the parties’ burdens  
8 in the case” and that plaintiffs were “not prejudiced” by such staggered disclosure. *Id.* Other  
9 courts have similarly reasoned that staggered disclosures are “more fair,” “less likely to result in  
10 requests for modification of [court deadlines],” and more effective at “remov[ing] surprise from  
11 trial preparation so the parties can obtain evidence necessary to evaluate and resolve their  
12 dispute.” *See, e.g. Brink's Home Sec. v. Caliber Holdings Co., LLC*, 2007 U.S. Dist. LEXIS  
13 17989, \*4; *Smith v. CRST Van Expedited, Inc.*, 2008 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 112648, \*4.; *Cable &*  
14 *Computer Tech., Inc. v. Lockheed Saunders, Inc.*, 175 F.R.D. 646, 650 (C.D. Cal. 1997); *Grove*  
15 *City Veterinary Serv., LLC v. Charter Practices, Int'l, LLC*, 2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 52646, \*64.  
Accordingly, the Defendants jointly request that Plaintiff’s expert witness disclosures predate the  
Defendants’ by 45 days.

16  
17 DATED this 9<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2024.

18 SCHODOWSKI LAW, INC. PS

19 s/ Joseph J. Schodowski

20 Joseph J. Schodowski, WSBA #42910

21 Attorneys for Plaintiffs

22 210 Polk Street, Ste. 8

23 Port Townsend, WA 98368

24 (360) 821-8873 Fax: (888) 474-1035

25 Email: joe@schodowskilaw.com

s/ Ryan D. Dreveskracht

Ryan D. Dreveskracht, WSBA #42593

8606 35th Avenue NE, Suite L1  
P.O. Box 15146  
Seattle, WA 98115  
Phone: (206) 557-7509  
Fax: (206) 299-7690  
Email: joe@galandabroadman.com  
ryan@galandabroadman.com  
***Attorneys for Plaintiffs***

LAW LYMAN DANIEL KAMERRER &  
BOGDANOVICH PS – TUMWATER

*s/John Edward Justice*

John Edward Justice, WSBA No. 23042  
2674 RW Johnson Blvd SW  
Tumwater, WA 98512  
T: 360-754-3480  
F: 360-357-3511  
Email: jjjustice@lldkb.com  
Attorney for Defendants Clallam County,  
Bill Benedict, Don Wenzl, Tyler Cortani,  
Kristin Michelle Puhl, Edward S. Berretta,  
Linsay Jane Monaghan, and Tamara Vanover

FOX BALLARD PLLC

*s/Ross C. Taylor*

Jonathan D. Ballard, WSBA No. 48870  
Ross C. Taylor, WSBA No. 48111  
1325 Fourth Avenue, Suite 1500  
Seattle WA 98101  
(206) 800-2727  
jonathan@foxballard.com  
ross@foxballard.com  
Attorneys for Defendants Wellpath LLC and  
Alicia C. Long